

02-277

From: Kathleen Abernathy
To: KAQUINN
Date: Mon, Feb 10, 2003 1:14 PM
Subject: Fwd: Consider The Needs Of Children!

From: rconcepcion@cfc.sbcounty.gov
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Mon, Feb 10, 2003 1:14 PM
Subject: Consider The Needs Of Children!

EX-10076 OR LATE FILED

FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy

Dear FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy,

I urge the FCC to consider the distinct needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in the development of children.

The relaxation of media ownership rules will result in significantly less original programming for children. Relaxation also will reduce competition, potentially stifling innovation and increasing commercialism in children's programming.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected

Sincerely,

Rowena Concepcion
330 north D Street
San Bernardino California 92415

cc
Senator Dianne Feinstein
Senator Barbara Boxer
Representative Joe Baca

From: Kathleen Abernathy
To: KAQUINN
Date: Mon, Feb 10, 2003 3:50 PM
Subject: Fwd: <No Subject>

EX-100-1-00-1015-FILE

From: Robert.Rafn@libertysite.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Mon, Feb 10, 2003 3:50 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

Dear FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy,

I have just learned (via a small community-supported radio station) that you are considering further loosening the restrictions on ownership of media outlets in the US. I am writing to request that you please not do so, and that you instead move towards greater restrictions on media ownership.

I am very concerned about what is happening with our public airwaves in the United States, and the fact that I found out at such a late date about your upcoming decision is indicative of one reason why I am concerned. NBC, CBS, ABC and Fox have an unprecedented monopoly over the use of my property - the public airwaves - and yet they have chosen not to inform me and the rest of the American public of this upcoming decision. Why? Because they stand to profit from it. and how I and the American public might feel about that is irrelevant to them. All they care about is that we watch the commercials and buy.

In the early days of television, there was at least an attempt to require broadcasters to serve the public. That goal has increasingly fallen by the wayside. Americans are relying on you to be a watchdog over this industry and to ensure that they are serving **us** - we need you to do your job and listen to us, rather than to broadcast industry reps with a vested interest in grabbing as much of our airwaves as possible.

Why am I so concerned about the idea of fewer broadcast companies controlling more and more of the broadcast spectrum and more and more of our news media? I am concerned because their profit motive conflicts with a necessary desire to provide complete, relevant and accurate news that best serves the public interest. Their lack of reporting on your upcoming decision is but one small example of this. But further, when fewer companies control the airwaves, the range of ideas and issues vital to a democracy gets more and more limited. Particularly at a time like we're in now, we need more ideas to be heard in our country. not less. Our media are supposed to be there to question and expose the actions of the powerful, yet by further loosening ownership requirements, you are increasingly turning them into the powerful that need to be exposed.

Of greatest concern to me is that with each decision like this that you make, you create an atmosphere where your decisions will be harder and harder to reverse if it is determined that fewer companies controlling our media is not serving the public good. Say, for example, that due to your decision, 3 companies come to control all TV stations, radio stations and newspapers in the US. They decide what will and will not be said in those media. Let's say hypothetically that this arrangement works out wonderfully for a few years, but at some point a new leadership takes over those 3 companies, and the new leadership decide that it serves their mutual business interest to convince the American public to bring back slavery, for example. Every newscast that they present on *NT* supports this opinion, slick PR people are brought in to generate unrelated news stories that also seem to support this idea, and with no other information to go on, American public sentiment begins to shift back towards embracing slavery.

Clearly fanning the flames of racism and encouraging slavery is not in the public interest. Yet what would you do to stop these 3 sole media giants from proceeding with their agenda? *You* will have made them so powerful that they can squelch any attempts you make to put the brakes on them, and if you get too much in their way they can simply convince the

public that the FCC needs to **be** disbanded.

This is just an example, and probably not the greatest or most believable one, but my point is that your decision is moving us towards an increasingly irreversible corporate media power structure with a stranglehold on our free flow of information. I urge you to reconsider your upcoming decision, and to work towards establishing regulations and structures that will enable the public to have more control and accountability over their media. The decision you are considering has the potential to do tremendous and permanent harm to our democracy, and I need you to hear and heed that concern.

Sincerely,

Robert Rafn
P.O. Box 75363
St. Paul, MN 55175